

02-277

**From:** mebane@mchsi.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:16 PM  
**Subject:** Media Monopolies

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across the nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Shawn Mebane  
1261 Brentwood Drive

Jamesville, NC 27846

**From:** Tom Morgan  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:17 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Dear Chairman Powell,

In one of your upcoming meetings, May I believe, you may be taking a vote on allowing companies to own a greater share of media services within a market. I believe strongly that if you allow companies a greater market share that it will restrict media competition in the United States and will be doing a disservice to the public. In addition, I believe that the public doesn't completely understand this issue and hasn't had sufficient input.

Please vote against this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Tom Morgan

**From:** Joanne N Nagy  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 3:21 PM  
**Subject:** vote on rule change

Dear Chairman Powell,

Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the American public.

However, one facet about the media that is being shortchanged is Public Information.

It is imperative that we, the public, in whose interest the licenses are granted by the FCC, have more time to learn about the possible changes in ownership limits.

It is not too late to get more hearings funded and to delay the vote on lifting the ownership cap past June 2, 2003.

Sincerely,

Joanne Nagy  
16500 Simonds Street  
Granada Hills, CA 91344  
818-363-4016  
jnn@juno.com

**From:** CarlS  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:57 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rulemakings

May 4, 2003

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC  
The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner, FCC

Comments re Broadcast Ownership Rulemakings on Dual Network, Radio  
Market Definition, Experimental Station and Newspaper/Broadcast  
Cross-Ownership

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect  
American Citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media  
conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news  
and information in communities across our nation. Many of the  
corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership  
rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing  
viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on  
important issues. They have the right to hear everyone, and that  
right should not be abrogated by government. Therefore, for the sake  
of our Constitutional Republic and our freedom, I urge you to continue  
the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to  
ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William Shires  
US Army (Ret.)  
1136 Johnnie Bud Lane  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

**From:** timothy stephan  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:05 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

peoples freedom of press is based on getting a honest and open exchange of ideas and info. if one owner controls the access to media, then money, power, or politics would be the over-riding factor. good rules last because they apply thru time. keep america free and don't change what has worked. tim stephan

**From:** diana-k@juno.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:15 PM  
**Subject:** Media Concentration: reply to public comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review  
of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules  
Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,  
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277,  
(rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To:  
FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell  
FCC Commissioners Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Michael J. Copps, Kevin J.  
Martin, and Jonathan S. Adelstein

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No.  
02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules.  
To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should  
RETAIN THE CURRENT MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES and impose stricter public  
interest requirements.

The studies commissioned by the FCC are flawed and incomplete. By  
allowing our media outlets to merge print and broadcast facilities a  
greater restriction on the breadth of news and information available to  
citizens to act in the public interest will result.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership  
rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I strongly encourage the Commission to hold hearings in all  
parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from  
the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of  
these decisions.

Thank you,

Diana Schmielt  
305 Ramona Drive  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

**From:** VICKI CORLEY  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:36 PM  
**Subject:** FCC media ownership rules

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am opposed to relaxing media-ownership rules for the FCC.

I am disturbed by the lack of coverage by our media and newspapers of important events like the Democratic contenders debate held last night at the University of South Carolina.

If even the Democrats cannot make themselves heard, what hope is there for smaller groups who have First Amendment rights to free speech and to having their speech and ideas published and seen?

I urge you, as a member of a "free" society, and as a member of the FCC, to make our media more open to differing ideas and opinions by making media-ownership rules more stringent, thus preventing big trusts from controlling free speech.

Yours sincerely,  
Vicki Corley

**From:** Michael Heilpern  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:36 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Michael Heilpern (michael@whereideaswork.com) writes:

Chairman Adelstein --

I am dismayed to learn that the commissioners will be voting in just a few weeks on further deregulation of media ownership in this country.

As president of a marketing communications firm in southern California, I can see no way in which the further concentration of media power in the hands of a few mega-corporations will enhance the workings of our democracy or enrich the lives of American citizens.

I find it disturbing as well that this important decision is about to be made without a full and open debate that reaches out to the American people. Needless to say, the commercial networks are not giving this any coverage. Clearly, it is not in their interest to do so.

Democracy cannot function without the free flow of information and opinion, and the concentration of media power in fewer hands means that fewer voices will be heard and fewer issues will be explored.

If you love this country and its democratic institutions, then I urge you delay this decision and to extend public hearings.

Yours,

Michael Heilpern  
1713 Shenandoah Drive  
Claremont, CA 91711

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 207.136.135.154  
Remote IP address: 207.136.135.154



**From:** William H. Hagerty  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:41 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership concern

Dear Chairman Powell: I am hearing about the concentration of ownership of the media in the hands of a few giant corporations and am concerned about the lack of responsiveness to the public interest that seems to result from this concentration of power. Please take time to review this important matter. Linda Hagerty  
-Linda and Bill Hagerty  
668 Snake Hill Rd.  
Morgantown, WV 26508  
304-594-0869-

**From:** VICKI CORLEY  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:47 PM  
**Subject:** media-ownership rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I am opposed to relaxing media-ownership rules for the FCC.

I am disturbed by the lack of coverage by our media and newspapers of important events like the Democratic contenders debate held last night at the University of South Carolina.

If even the Democrats cannot make themselves heard, what hope is there for smaller groups who have First Amendment rights to free speech and to having their speech and ideas published and seen?

I urge you, as a member of a "free" society, and as a member of the FCC, to make our media more open to differing ideas and opinions by making media-ownership rules more stringent, thus preventing big trusts from controlling free speech.

Yours sincerely,

Vicki Corley

**From:** Cynthia Ross  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:56 PM  
**Subject:** Deregulation--already too much

Dear FCC officials,

I am writing to go on record as being against any further deregulation of the media/airwaves by the FCC--in fact I would prefer to see this group "put things back the way they were." I do not think the regulations are/were out-of-date and in need of change--any more than the Constitution is out-of-date.

The regulations are/were fine for today's world, just as when first written. Deregulation/change is placing the control of the newspapers, TV, and radio in the hands of a very few people and therefore is stifling opinion and diversity. Previous deregulation has already had an adverse effect. American "journalists" are becoming the laughing stock of the world because they are managed by the few media owners and the government. Much of what is broadcast follows the line of FOX news and their many newspapers. In American, if you want to know what is really happening (impartial journalism) you need to go to the media in another country. That is sad! Please don't make it even worse!

Thank you for your time.  
Cindy Ross

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.  
<http://search.yahoo.com>

**From:** unity@linkamerica.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:06 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kim Newsome  
Box 912  
Dahlonega, Georgia 30533-0016

cc:  
Senator Saxby Chambliss  
Representative Charlie Norwood  
Senator Zell Miller

**From:** John Rook  
**To:** Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:17 PM  
**Subject:** Fw: Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters!

----- Original Message -----

From: <darren.macdonald@hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>  
To: <JHRook@earthlink.net>  
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 6:20 AM  
Subject: re: Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters!

Good day John. Great story on Art Roberts. I never heard about the cold shoulder you first got at WLS. As for the article from CP, a few comments.

1. Izzy Asper and family are attempting to become the biggest media conglomerate in Canada. They also control directly the editorial pages of all their papers, to the point that local boards cannot publish their own opinions. Prime Minister Chretien has recieved more than a few glowing tributes this way.

2. Bell Globalmedia owns the biggest newspaper in Canada, the Globe and mail, the #1 TV network CTV, and many CTV local affiliates. A few years ago, they took control of Atlantic Television Systems here, and since, have layed off staff, cut back programing and gotten into more riske type shows. (The Sopranos plays on CTV here)

3. Locally, in New Brunswick, we have 20 private radio stations ( 9 owned by Maritime Broadcasting sysytems, 2 by Newcap, 4 by Astral Media and 5 by the Irving Group of companies, the only ones that are owned by a New Brunswick company. MBS is run from Halifax and consulted heavily by US consulants. Newcap and Astral have changed hands several times in recent years. As for Newspapers, all dailys and most weeklys are owned by Irving. TV is CBC, ATV (Bell Globalmedia) and Global (Izzy Asper). Very little local control in any of it.

If I were you in the US, I'd be very worried. Imagine if Clear Channel controled not only radio and music companies, but almost the entire media of you area. It could happen. It has here, and it is more frightening than you can imagine.

Darren MacDonald

----- Original Text -----

From: "JHRook" <JHRook@earthlink.net>, on 2003-03-02 7:47 PM:

Example of things to come for broadcasting in the US?  
Make your feelings known at [www.JohnRook.com](http://www.JohnRook.com)

Located online at  
<http://www.cp.org/english/online/full/media/030227/X022720AU.html>

-----  
---

Foreign ownership changes must include broadcasters, CanWest boss says  
SUE BAILEY

OTTAWA (CP) - More foreign investment wouldn't threaten Canadian content and should be available to all broadcasters, says the head of CanWest Global Communications.

"We think the economic benefits far outweigh the potential and illusory threats to culture," Leonard Asper, president and CEO of Canada's second-largest private broadcaster, told MPs on Thursday. He urged the Commons industry committee to raise or even scrap foreign ownership limits for telecommunications firms - but only if broadcasters get the same treatment.

The all-party committee is to recommend in coming weeks whether to change rules restricting foreigners to minority stakes in Canadian phone companies.

Foreign ownership is now limited to 46.7 per cent for the operating arms of domestic phone and cable TV firms.

Asper argued that overlapping interests mean investment caps can't be lifted for the telecommunications sector alone.

"There are many important competitive linkages among providers of telecommunication services, cable and satellite distributors of broadcast signals," he said.

While satellite companies have said they should be treated the same as telecommunications firms, Asper urged MPs to also include conventional and cable broadcasters.

Canadian content rules would still be enforced by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), he stressed.

"They're going to be upheld because licensing depends on it," Asper said.

"The international experience is that foreign companies bend over backwards to show they are good corporate citizens and comply with the rules."

He also downplayed fears that foreign owners would cut Canadian jobs.

"You have to employ local people to put local productions together."

CRTC rules require broadcasters to have an overall Canadian content of 60 per cent on average, and 50 per cent during prime time. In addition, eight hours of "priority Canadian content" - often dramas - must be aired weekly.

CanWest owns the country's largest newspaper chain, including the National Post, forged from the former Southam newspaper group, now called CanWest Publications Inc., and the Global TV Network.

A telecommunications company such as BCE Inc., owner of Bell Telephone, is also in the satellite TV business through Bell ExpressVu. And it holds a majority stake in Bell Globemedia, owner of the Globe and Mail newspaper and CTV - one of CanWest's major broadcasting rivals, Asper said.

In such a climate, excluding CanWest from increased foreign investment "could have a very significant effect on our bottom line."

Smaller companies struggling to compete against telecommunications giants BCE and Telus Corp. have pushed for an end to foreign ownership limits.

They say established firms have access to large reserves of cash, while start-up competitors must fight over limited amounts of risk capital.

Some broadcasters earlier told the committee that foreign limits should be maintained to protect Canadian culture on air.

"CanWest does not subscribe to that narrow and protectionist view," Asper said.

, The Canadian Press, 2003

**From:** Clyde Snyder  
**To:** KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:26 PM  
**Subject:** broadcast ownership rules

If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across America could be snuffed out by huge media corporations!!

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these changes, including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC, are the same companies that have tried in the past to keep viewpoints off the air!!

Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by ONE media company which could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

PLEASE DO NOT RELAX THE BROADCAST OWNERSHIP RULES THAT PREVENT MEDIA MONOPOLIES!!!!!!

=====  
Ed Snyder

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.  
<http://search.yahoo.com>



**From:** Dave Evans  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:28 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Dave Evans (fuelev@terra.com.net) writes:

There has been way too much media monopoly already. It's as if the regulatory agencies have become subsidiaries of the corporations. One big happy rich family is killing the U.S. I've heard the airwaves once belonged to the citizens. Now the corporation owns them. The t.v. generally spins a pro-Bush, pro-war message because they know which side of the bread gets the butter. Enough is enough.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 208.170.95.139  
Remote IP address: 208.170.95.139

**From:** dave  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:28 PM  
**Subject:** Don't Do It!

PLEASE don't allow further consolidation of the media. The "air waves" were public domain and there was an obligation for public service.

We the people are being overruled by powerful money. The information access was not to be so thoroughly commercializes as it has become and Mr. Powell wants to go further in the wrong direction.

#### DIVERSITY

Diversity is what has made the US good, and that requires diversity of opinions. That requires diversity, real not in name only, in the information marketplace.

Deregulation has gone too far, the Iraq War had a 300 to 1 ratio of hawks to doves!

You hold the fabric of America in your hands, do you want to further damage it?

Save the voices and diversity.

Thank you,  
Dave Cavanaugh

**From:** paul chadwick  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:29 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

paul chadwick (pnchad@earthlink.net) writes:

no more DE-regulation

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.32.165.205  
Remote IP address: 66.32.165.205

**From:** J Harvey Herring  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:45 PM  
**Subject:** Protect our free speech rights

I am sending this email urging all of you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect us AMERICAN citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge all of you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Is this not what one hundred thirty-eight of our military people died for in Iraq? I guess Saddam Hussein would like and support this law in his former country. Do not let our people die in vain!

Thank you for supporting our free speech rights!

J. Harvey Herring  
2425 Robbie Lee  
Nesbit, MS. 38651

**From:** anne lightsey  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:56 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

anne lightsey (arlightsey@att.net) writes:

DO NOT relax or get rid of rules which would allow more media concentration. There is way to much mediation concentration as it is. It is the FCC's mission and responsibility to make sure I have a wide variety of views, not many outlets owned by the few.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.86.28.96  
Remote IP address: 12.86.28.96

**From:** Dale  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:05 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Biennial Regulatory Review 2002

I have become aware that a decision will be made on June 2, 2003 that may change the limits for ownership and broadcasting of radio, television, cable etc. Please do NOT change the existing rules. We Americans have lost so many of our freedoms since September 11. We need to maintain freedom of discussion- debate on all sides of the important issues we face in our country.

Allowing large companies to monopolize ownership of our stations and airways would limit the free discourse we have always enjoyed and that is so important in making informed decisions in a democracy.

We need small local stations manned by people who care about their community to be there to keep us informed about issues and events that immediately affect us. The "canned" programs broadcasted from places far from where we live cannot possibly perform this important service. So maintaining the broadcasting distance limits is vital.

There is also a rule to limit the ownership of a television station and newspaper in the same market. Once again, to present opposing views to important issues, it is vital to maintain this limit.

Please do not continue this perilous downward spiral of losing our precious freedoms.

**From:** William K. Medlin  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:12 PM  
**Subject:** Citizen inputs on Mass Media structuring

Dear FCC Commissioners: Your apparent intent within a month's time to vote on major restructuring of the rules governing the corporate character of electronic communications appears premature and far too expeditious, especially from the perspective of citizen review, study and participation in a process vitally affecting the totality of our nation. In a democratic polity, it is absolutely unthinkable that a Federal agency would proceed to changing the rules whereby the vast public obtains its information, culture, recreation and political ideas which are essential to the commonweal, without due citizen review and due process (cf. US Constitution)

Never in our history has so much power been placed at the disposal of corporate entities whose capacities for controlling, shaping and directing the course of public life -- and these largely for the major, though not exclusive, purpose of selling and buying goods and services. The total commercialization of public media, whose PRIMARY function is to serve the public welfare, will surely lead to greater, not less, concentration of decision making, and to much less range of choice by consumers.

Aside from the power and concentration issue, there is the constant need of smaller states and communities for independent media services that respond to their circumstances. The "tyranny of the majority" (to quote Locke and Rousseau) can be a terrible blight on the aspirations of those who do not wield the financial or political power needed to create and control their information systems, essential to the good functioning of their societies. Here in Idaho, and most of the Northwest territory, we must have more choice and flexibility, even with present modes of media ownership.

Finally, creativity and originality would surely be constrained by rules which encourage more mergers, concentration and centralization -- attributes which are completely alien to pluralistic democracy. "E pluribus unum" has no meaning if the pluribus becomes smothered in the race for "unity", defined as monopolistic consortia controlling what we read, hear and see in our public media -- yes, OUR PUBLIC MEDIA! THE PEOPLE MUST HAVE A VOICE IN THIS MATTER OF FCC RULES CHANGE !!! Please take note.

Respectfully submitted,

William K. Medlin (PhD)

**CC:** Philip Medlin, Delia Medlin

**From:** jp@mcb.harvard.edu  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 11:25 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

J Poolner  
General Delivery  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02478

cc:  
Senator Edward Kennedy  
Senator John Kerry  
Representative Edward Markey